

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of Applicants' Request for Continued Examination.

Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define the invention and overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejection set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention.

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to improved systems and methods for seamlessly delivering multimedia content including WEB content such as WEB pages. More specifically, Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a system which receives multimedia information including a data stream comprising commands and displayable indicia associated with the commands. In the preferred embodiment, the data stream comprises WEB content with program schedule information and commands to navigate and view program information as well as control various television functions. Advantageously, Applicants have discovered that significant improvements over prior art techniques can be achieved by repetitively scanning relevant WEB content such as programming schedule information and transmitting the same to various users. As a result, the programming schedule information is regularly and repeatedly updated in a memory of the system. For example, the Specification discloses that in the preferred embodiment marked pages with commands, such as those provided by programming service providers, are scanned in a repetitive operation, uploaded in a data stream and continuously broadcast to reception dishes. See generally pages 6-7.

Applicants note that the prior art cited by the Examiner, Broadwin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,850) is directed to on-demand display of still images related to video content in a

manner similar to web-like navigation. Broadwin et al. merely discloses that AVI signals including audio/visual content as well as interactive applications associated with the audio/visual content is provided. See Column 6, lines 18-23. Additionally, still images related to video content are provided on a still image channel. See Column 6, lines 23-26. When a user selects a selection option, originally written in HTML, the system retrieves the corresponding still image by capturing the image from the still image broadcast channel stream, stores the image and displays the same. See generally, Column 10; see also column 2, lines 60-66.

In contrast, the present invention significantly improves and is patentably distinct from this prior art system because the present invention repetitively scans and broadcasts actual WEB content such as program schedule information with links to other WEB content and/or commands to control television functions such as changing channel. This is essentially different and patentably distinct from Broadwin which merely discloses selection of an image for display and not automatic television control changes. Additionally, although Broadwin et al. discloses that a multimedia broadcast stream is received by a receiver and displayed for user selection and manipulation, the stream comprises of especially designed interactive screens with links to still images presented on a still image channel. However, the present invention utilizes a data stream which seamlessly integrates and preferably utilizes the WEB content itself in the program schedule guide. Moreover, Broadwin et al. does not teach or suggest that selections within the program guide may be used to control various television functions. Therefore, an improved system for presenting interactive multimedia information such as WEB content with program schedule information and commands within the WEB content to navigate and view program information as well as control various television functions is provided. Simply put, Broadwin et al. does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention. Significantly, none of the references teach or suggest advantageously repetitively scanning and broadcasting the data stream including WEB content with links to view other WEB content or commands to control television functions.

In particular, the Examiner has asserted that Broadwin et al. teaches all aspects of the invention except that the programming information is particularly future programming information. Furthermore, the Examiner has asserted that the recognized deficiency is present in Eyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,982, 455). Eyer et al. discloses a system for receiving a multimedia stream with program information in HTML format with tags that link to other information or control television functions, displaying the same, and executing television functions in response to user selections. See generally, columns 4-5. However, Eyer et al. does not teach or suggest utilizing memory which is regularly replenished with program schedule information. In the present invention, the receiver receives a multimedia data stream that is intentionally and repetitively scanned and broadcast. Therefore, in the present invention, the program information may be continually and automatically updated. This precludes users from viewing incorrect programming information when an actual broadcast program is changed.

Eyer et al. does not teach or suggest a system that achieves the advantageous benefits and characteristics of the present invention. Consequently, there is simply no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding Applicants' claimed multimedia broadcast delivery system and method which repetitively replenishes program schedule information.

The Examiner has further stated that independent claims 16 and 25 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Harper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,585,858) in view of Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,620). Harper et al. is directed to systems and methods for delivery of

interactive content which contains trigger points, markers on the broadcast program which trigger macros, to alter program content by invoking or displaying personalized content based on stored subscriber selections to questions at the beginning of a show or preferably based on prior answers to the questions. See generally, columns 2-3. This personalized content is embedded in unused lines of video. Harper et al. does not teach repetitively scanning and broadcasting WEB content to a receiver which results in regularly updated program information. Furthermore, Harper et al. merely discloses that additional personalized video or audio content can be presented to a user and does not teach or suggest that commands in WEB content may be used to control television functions.

The Examiner asserts that Harper et al. does not explicitly teach that the displayable data stream includes future programming information. However, the Examiner has asserted that this teaching is present in Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,620). Coleman et al. teaches that database information comprising programming information such as time slots, titles, etc. is transmitted wherein different categories of data are carried in different packet streams. See column 4, lines 24-48. Database information comprising current data is transmitted in a stream which is stored in memory whereas information comprising future data is transmitted in an on-demand stream which is acquired after user selection to view future information. See column 4, lines 49-64. Coleman et al. does not teach or suggest that programming information including WEB content comprising commands to control television functions such as changing channels is repetitively broadcast to the receiver and continually updated for the viewer. Consequently, there is simply no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding Applicants' claimed multimedia broadcast delivery system in the prior art whether considered alone, or in combination.

Therefore, presently amended claims 16 and 25 are patentably distinct from the prior art. In addition, Claims 17-24 and 26-33 are dependent from independent claims 16 and 25.

Since claims 16 and 25 are in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above, claims 17-24 and 26-33 are also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants' invention is patentability distinct over the art of record. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Date: November 17, 2003

Respectfully submitted,


Robert J. Depke

(Reg. #37,607)

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC

131 South Dearborn Street, 30th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60603

Tel: (312) 422-9050

Attorney for Applicants